

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

MICHELLE ORR,

Plaintiff,

v.

COMMISSIONER, SOCIAL
SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 6:20-cv-421-JDK-KNM

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**


This case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. On November 2, 2020, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the Court grant the Commissioner's Motion for Summary Judgment or, Alternatively, Motion to Dismiss and dismiss this action with prejudice. Docket No. 7.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days). Here, Plaintiff did file objections. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion

and reviews legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 7) as the findings of this Court. The Commissioner's Motion for Summary Judgment or, Alternatively, Motion to Dismiss (Docket No. 6) is **GRANTED** and the above-styled civil action is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**. All pending motions are **DENIED** as **MOOT**.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **17th** day of **November, 2020**.



JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE